



"McWilliams, Douglas"
<DMcWilliams@ssd.com>

07/10/2006 02:42 PM

To

Subject RE: CRS - Extension for NOD Response

EPA Region 5 Records Ctr.



279471

Ms. Massenburg,

Thank you for the formal written approval of the extension request. Parsons has prepared the following minutes from the June 30th meeting. Please let us know if you have any corrections or concerns with the understandings reflected in the meeting minutes. The CRS Site Group is currently reviewing the proposed RI/FS changes reflected in these meeting minutes to formally direct Parsons to make these changes. We would appreciate any feedback on the minutes that may affect the RI/FS revisions at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Douglas A. McWilliams
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
4900 Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, OH 44114-1304
Tel: +1.216.479.8332
Fax: +1.216.479.8776
dmcwilliams@ssd.com
www.ssd.com <<http://www.ssd.com>>

Confidentiality Statement
NOTICE: This e-mail message

and all

attachments transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the addressees and may contain legally privileged, protected, or confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail reply and please delete this message from your computer and destroy any copies. Thank you.
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.

Beijing Bratislava Brussels Budapest Caracas Cincinnati
Cleveland Columbus Hong Kong Houston London Los Angeles Madrid Miami
Milan Moscow New York Palo Alto Phoenix Prague Rio de Janeiro San
Francisco Santo Domingo Shanghai Tallahassee Tampa Tokyo Tysons Corner
Warsaw Washington DC West Palm Beach
Associated Offices: Bucharest Buenos Aires Dublin Kyiv Santiago

-----Original Message-----

From: Massenburg.Gwendolyn@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Massenburg.Gwendolyn@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 1:00 PM
To: McWilliams, Douglas
Cc: larry.antonelli@epa.state.oh.us; lrmencin@sherwin.com;
peter.gelman@parsons.com; Nash.Thomas@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE: CRS - Extension for NOD Response

Mr. McWilliams:

This email is to serve as official notification granting your extension request we received on June 12, 2006 to August 7, 2006 on the Remedial

Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) Report deliverable. The decision to extend the request is based on our June 30th conference call with Parsons regarding the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) risk assessment additions we have asked to be added to the RI/FS report.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or additional information is need.

Sincerely,
Gwendolyn Massenburg
Remedial Project Manager
U. S. EPA
77 W. Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60604
312-886-0983 (v)
312-886-4071 (f)

"McWilliams,
Douglas"
<DMcWilliams@ssd
.com>

06/12/2006 02:39
PM

To
Gwendolyn
Massenburg/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
larry.antonelli@epa.state.oh.us,
Thomas Nash/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

cc
lrmencin@sherwin.com,
peter.gelman@parsons.com

Subject
RE: CRS - Appendix E Response and
Request for Telephone Conference
and Extension for NOD Response

Gwen, Larry and Tom,

Attached please find Parsons' response to your May 24th e-mail requesting additional information regarding the laboratory QA/QC for Appendix E of the CRS RI/FS documentation. The response includes a letter and two attachments.

<<Letter to Massenburg re Lab QAQC 06-12-06.pdf>> <<PSCRSPCB0803.pdf>>
<<CRS MSMSD ltr.pdf>> We expect that this will answer Ohio EPA's questions and concerns.
However, please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions

about the attached.

We have also received your June 7, 2006 NOD/Conditional Approval. We are surprised by the number of additional comments raised given the extra effort made after the last draft to try and define precisely the revisions that would address all of EPA's concerns. Apparently this process left us with a misperception in some areas as to what revisions would be acceptable to your agency. We would like to schedule a brief conference call sometime after we complete our initial review on June 20, 2006 so that we can get our clarifying questions answered before drafting revisions. We will need some additional time after the conference call to generate draft revisions as needed, then to have the drafts reviewed and approved by the CRS Site Group, and then to prepare what we hope will be the final revisions to the RI/FS for submission to USEPA.

Therefore, we ask for an extension until Monday, 7 August 2006, to formally respond to the deficiencies in your June 7th letter.

Sincerely,

Douglas A. McWilliams
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
4900 Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, OH 44114-1304
Tel: +1.216.479.8332
Fax: +1.216.479.8776
dmcwilliams@ssd.com
www.ssd.com <<http://www.ssd.com>>

Confidentiality Statement

NOTICE: This e-mail message and all attachments transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the addressees and may contain legally privileged, protected, or confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail reply and please delete this message from your computer and destroy any copies. Thank you.
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.

Beijing Bratislava Brussels Budapest Caracas Cincinnati
Cleveland Columbus Hong Kong Houston London Los Angeles Madrid Miami
Milan Moscow New York Palo Alto Phoenix Prague Rio de Janeiro San
Francisco Santo Domingo Shanghai Tallahassee Tampa Tokyo Tysons Corner
Warsaw Washington DC West Palm Beach

Associated Offices: Bucharest Buenos Aires Dublin Kyiv Santiago

-----Original Message-----

From: Massenburg.Gwendolyn@epamail.epa.gov [
mailto:Massenburg.Gwendolyn@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2006 5:57 PM
To: peter.gelman@parsons.com
Cc: McWilliams, Douglas; Nash.Thomas@epamail.epa.gov;
larry.antonelli@epa.state.oh.us
Subject: CRS - Appendix E

Hello Mr. Gelman:

I am forwarding the email below regarding questions that was raised by Ohio EPA as it relates to QA/QC and Appendix E. Would you please forward the questions in the email below to the lab that performed the analysis and submit a response to me as soon as possible. On a different note, I am still in the process of reviewing the RI/FS Report, you should be getting comments soon. If you have any questions or need additional information please let me know.

Thanks,
Gwendolyn Massenburg
Remedial Project Manager
U. S. EPA
77 W. Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60604
312-886-0983 (v)
312-886-4071 (f)

----- Forwarded by Gwendolyn Massenburg/R5/USEPA/US on 05/24/2006 04:42 PM -----

Larry Antonelli
<larry.antonelli
@epa.state.oh.us
>

05/18/2006 07:43
AM

Gwendolyn
Massenburg/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

To

cc

Subject

CRS - Appendix E

Hi, Gwen-

I got your message, and reviewed Appendix E in more detail. Keep in mind that I am not a QC expert by any means, so perhaps some of the things that are questionable to me may indeed prove to be no issue.

The 3 page Data Usability Worksheet for activities such as Field Sampling, Analytical Techniques, DQO's, and Data Validation and

Interpretation did NOT indicate QC problems with the site data.

However, things that raised questions with me are as follows:

1) With respect to the organic data quality review report for PCB's, the SDG number/batch A3G150214 is NOT listed anywhere in the main SDG key page. Also, the surrogate spikes did not meet the recovery limits defined in the contract. It is stated that the guidelines allow for a single surrogate to be out of control, and no qualification is required for those samples. So, I'm not sure how significant this is. But, the SDG # referenced above should be explained.

2) An MS/MSD was not analyzed in accordance with requirements (ie. for every analysis, and for every 20 samples, or for every matrix - whichever is more frequent). Only 1 MS/MSD was analyzed for the entire project (in A3G100284) which was not from any of the PRP's samples. Is this common? Since the MS/MSD was not a PRP sample, it's stated that the matrix accuracy and precision cannot be determined.

Generally, it was things like instrument calibrations, surrogate recoveries, relative percent differences, and internal lab standards that didn't appear to always meet project criteria. I really don't know if these are significant problems. It was signed off by the laboratory that the data set as a whole was of sufficient quality, and considered to be fully acceptable and usable.

Maybe you could ask your QC folks if this is not uncommon for environmental data. Call me if there are any questions.
best,
L. Antonelli

(See attached file: Letter to Massenburg re Lab QAQC 06-12-06.pdf) (See attached file: PSCRSPCB0803.pdf) (See attached file: CRS MSMSD ltr.pdf)



CRS Meeting Minutes 06-30-06 draft to EPA.doc

Meeting Minutes
Chemical Recovery Systems, Inc.
June 30, 2006

Meeting Attendees:

Gwen Massenburg, U.S. EPA
Dr. Andrew Podowski, U.S. EPA
Larry Antonelli, Ohio EPA
Dianna Silverman, Metcalf & Eddy
Bob Budzilek, Metcalf & Eddy
Larry Mencin, CRS Site Group Technical Committee Chair
Steve Schmidt, CRS Site Group Technical Committee
Peter Gelman, Parsons
Beth McCartney, Parsons
Dr. Fan Wang-Cahill, Parsons

A telephone conference call was held on June 30, 2006 at 2:00 pm EST to discuss comments provided by the U.S. EPA on the RI/FS report for the Chemical Recovery Systems (CRS) site located in Elyria, Ohio. The comments were provided to CRS on June 7, 2006.

At the start of the meeting, Peter Gelman stated that only the comments for the human health risk assessment provided by U.S. EPA need additional clarification including the following: two significant human health risk assessment comments, central tendency and Table 7.1. These meeting minutes follow this order of discussion. Additionally, Mr. Gelman asked for approval of the extension for the response to USEPA to August 7, 2006.

Significant Technical Comments

Section 4.2, Page 19 of 41: The trespasser exposure frequency was not increased as requested and little additional justification was provided in the revised report to support the 12 day/year assumed exposure frequency. For example, for sediment, if one was planning on taking an action at the site for sediments to prevent or mitigate exposures at a greater frequency than 12 day/year, then the risk assessment needs to evaluate a higher level of assumed exposure. Section 7.2 of the RI reads that sediments may pose an unacceptable risk if land use is changed from industrial use to parkland. This statement is unsubstantiated by the current risk assessment and needs to be supported by risk calculations. Clean up of any medium or the use of institutional controls at a site can not be base on assumed risk. Instead, the risk assessment needs to demonstrate the quantitative risk before an action can be taken.

Dr. Wang-Cahill restated the following justifications that we provided previously as to the rationale for selecting a 12 day exposure frequency for a trespasser scenario:

- 1) the size of the site;
- 2) industrial use of the site;

- 3) the closest resident is located across Black River; and
- 4) access to the site is difficult.

Larry Mencin added that the site is fenced and the river bank has one side that has steep rock walls and the other side is hard to access as well.

Mr. Gelman stated that the site occupies only about 10% of the peninsula. The Engelhard Company occupies almost all of the remaining area on the peninsula.

Dr. Podowski stated that he would really like to use 50 days exposure frequency because 50 days is representative for a trespasser scenario, especially when there are residents nearby.

Dr. Wang-Cahill stated that she understands that 50 days is more representative for a site located near a residential area. However, the industrial nature of the site and surrounding area make it more appropriate to use a site-specific value of 12 days.

Dianna Silverman stated that the 50 days is to address future concerns if the land use is changed.

Gwen Massenburg requested to add a future trespasser scenario calculations using 50 days exposure frequency in an Appendix and add text for a future trespasser to address Dr. Podowski's concern.

Steve Schmidt suggested that this issue be discussed with the CRS technical committee before making a final decision. (The CRS Site Group Technical Committee is reviewing this and other proposed agreements reached during this meeting.)

Tables 14 and 15, Oral Absorption Efficiencies: Based on information provided in Table 16 and in the risk calculation spreadsheets, it appears that the toxicity values provided in EPA's draft trichloroethene (TCE) cancer reassessment were not used. Instead CalEPA toxicity values were used. However, the discussion in the uncertainty section (Section 7.3) and in the Section 6.1 indicates that the draft TCE toxicity values were used in the risk calculations. A presentation of risks using the EPA draft TCE toxicity values could not be located in the revised risk assessment. Please clarify and correct the risk calculations by using the EPA's draft cancer reassessment toxicity values for TCE.

Dr. Wang-Cahill explained that the reasons not to use U.S. EPA's draft cancer reassessment toxicity values are due to numerous technical comments received during the review of the NCEA draft cancer reassessment toxicity values for TCE. The technical comments are 1) selectively using and/or misrepresenting epidemiological and animal data; 2) including studies without adequate consideration of their quality and/or appropriateness; 3) not adequately supporting the cancer classification with appropriate quantitative data; 4) not appropriately considering the limitations and uncertainties of the pharmacokinetic models; and 5) displaying an unacceptable degree of bias and significant errors of interpretation. CalEPA's toxicity values are recommended by Ohio EPA. This is stated in one of Ohio EPA's Technical Decision Compendium.

Dr. Podowski stated that it is Region 5's decision to do comparison calculations and include the calculations in the report.

Dr. Wang-Cahill suggested adding a statement using the ratio comparison.

Ms. Massenburg expressed concern that a future reviewer might miss the information.

Dr. Wang-Cahill explained that the information will not be missed by a future reviewer since it will be stated in the executive summary.

Ms. Massenburg stated that she would like to add it in the risk summary as well.

Dr. Podowski stated that he would like to see the calculations included as well.

Dr. Wang-Cahill raised concerns that it would be very time consuming to include the results in the tables.

Mr. Mencin suggested a statement in the executive summary, risk summary, and uncertainty sections citing the risk calculations included in an appendix, rather than revising the tables.

Based on the discussion everyone agreed to add an appendix to include risk calculations using the EPA's draft cancer reassessment toxicity values for TCE; include a discussion in the uncertainty; and add a statement in the executive summary and risk summary sections to discuss the differences.

Other Comments:

Section 4.2, last paragraph, Page 20 of 41 (previous comment): The report has not been revised to include central tendency risk/hazard estimates for those pathways exceeding regulatory criteria. Although, decisions made at Superfund sites, regarding remedies, are based on upperbound risk estimates not on central tendency risk estimates, the guidance recommends that central tendency estimates be included in risk assessments.

Dr. Wang-Cahill explained that the reasons for not calculating the central tendency is because the remedial goals are not determined based on central tendency. Central tendency is recommended by EPA guidance because it can provide useful information when the risk calculated based on maximum reasonable exposure only slightly exceed the target risk and target hazard index, which is not the case at the CRS site. Therefore, central tendency was not calculated for the site. Additional justification will be added to the uncertainty section.

After private discussion by Ms. Massenburg and Dr. Podowski, US EPA agreed that central tendency will not have to be calculated and they requested that the explanation to be added to both uncertainty section and discussion section.

Based on the discussion, the following statement will be added to the uncertainty and risk summary sections: "In addition, the central tendency will not provide significant information to the risk assessment when the calculated risk that is based on the reasonable maximum exposure scenario substantially exceeds the target risk level and target hazard index."

Table 7.1: The Target Levels for soil contact should be based on the summed risk associated with the three exposure routes of interest (ingestion, dermal contact, and inhalation). Target levels for VOCs in soil are currently based only on the inhalation pathway which is not the only exposure pathway contributing to risk. Target levels for non-volatile compounds (e.g., arsenic) should not only be based on ingestion and dermal contact since the inhalation of particulates is also a complete exposure pathway. Please

re-calculate the soil target levels such that they are protective of all three exposure pathways.

Dr. Wang-Cahill asked whether Region 9's methodology is the one that US EPA would like to be used at this site.

Dr. Podowski replied yes.

Dr. Wang-Cahill confirmed that the target Levels for soil contact will be calculated based on the summed risk associated with the three exposure routes of interest (ingestion, dermal contact and inhalation) for VOCs and ingestion and dermal contact for non-volatile compounds.

Table 7.1: *The Target Levels associated with a hazard quotient (HQ) of 1 should be calculated for all compounds of concern because there will be instances where the target level associated with 1E-04 is greater than that associated with the HQ of 1 (e.g., for benzene in indoor air from ground water, the 1E-04 level is 53.1 mg/L, while the HQ of 1 level is 43 mg/L). If the target level associated with a cancer risk of 1E-04 is selected as the site-specific clean up level as part of the risk management process, this selected value would not be protective of non-cancer health effect. The lower of the appropriate cancer and non-cancer values should be selected for use as the cleanup level. Furthermore, it must be noted that a Target Level of 1E-04 or HQ of 1, calculated for any specific COC, is not the final site-specific clean up level for that COC. The Target Level must lie within Superfund's acceptable risk range of 10⁻⁴ to 10⁻⁶ or HI of 1 as a Total Cumulative Risk Level for all COCs selected.*

Dr. Wang-Cahill asked whether US EPA would prefer if all three risk level (10⁻⁴, 10⁻⁵ and 10⁻⁶) calculations or just 10⁻⁵ target risk level be presented on Table 7.1.

After an internal discussion by US EPA, US EPA stated that they would prefer that all three risk level calculations be presented on the table.

Dr. Podowski also pointed out that the lower of the appropriate cancer and non-cancer values has to be selected for use as the cleanup level, and the total target level must be within Superfund's acceptable risk range of 10⁻⁴ to 10⁻⁶ or HI of 1 grouped by target organ as a total cumulative risk level for all COCs selected.

Dr. Wang-Cahill stated that a ratio approach would be used to develop the cumulative target levels (i.e. adjusting individual target risk or hazard level by the percentage of the risk or hazard that the compound is contributing to ensure that the cumulative target risk of 10⁻⁴ and the cumulative target hazard index of 1 will not be exceeded.) Per Dr. Podowski clarification of this comment, this would be the appropriate methodology to use.

Table 7.1: *The Target Levels for soil and ground water compounds contributing to excess risk/hazard for residential exposures should be included. Even if the site is not cleaned up to residential criteria (i.e., commercial/industrial criteria are selected as clean up criteria), the inclusion of residential target levels may provide useful information in the future should a change in land use be contemplated by future land owners.*

Dr. Wang-Cahill explained that target levels were not calculated for a residential scenario in the FS because target levels for a residential scenario are not applicable for the site when a deed restriction is part of the remedy.

Ms. Massenburg stated that for the completeness of the evaluation, US EPA would like the target levels for a residential scenario included for informational purposes in case future use of the site changes to residential use.

Dr. Wang-Cahill asked whether it was acceptable to use Region 9's PRGs as the residential target levels since the Region 9 PRGs are protective for a residential scenario.

Dr. Podowski stated that Region 9 PRGs don't consider cumulative effects.

After further internal discussion by U.S. EPA, after which Larry Antonelli exited the call, U.S. EPA agreed that using Region 9 PRGs as target levels to address the future potential residential use was acceptable with the caveat that cumulative effects for target levels under a future residential scenario should be reevaluated.

Thus, it was agreed by all parties that target levels will not be calculated for a residential scenario. Instead, a statement will be added to the text explaining that Region 9 PRGs will be used as the target levels for a residential scenario and cumulative effects should be considered prior to initiating future residential use.

At the end, Ms. Massenburg summarized the main points of discussion and approved the extension request to allow the revised draft RI/FS sections to be delivered on or before August 7, 2006. Peter Gelman stated that Parsons would prepare minutes of the meeting, which would be distributed to all meeting participants for review of their accuracy. The meeting ended at approximately 3:15 pm (EST) June 30, 2006.